

NP CPUAC #7 Meeting Notes
February 16, 2011

Discussion on the existing Community Facilities Goal and Objectives was discussed followed by a continued discussion on the recreational equivalencies.

Community Facilities Element Discussion

Comments regarding current goal:

1. Revise goal to read, "~~Establish and maintain~~ Promote and ensure that a high level of sustainable public facilities and services exists to meet the diverse needs of the community."

Comments regarding current objectives:

1. Objective #1 – Provide educational facilities, law enforcement, fire protection, libraries and public utilities in accordance with City standards - no comment
2. Objective #2 – Revise to read, "Provide facilities that accommodate a full range of City programs to serve residents ~~Provide child care services to serve families in North Park.~~"
3. Add an objective that calls for incorporation of art in public facilities
4. Include something on the use of joint-use facilities.
5. Objective #3 – Revise to read, "Program the systematic improvement and gradual replacement of water and sewer facilities."
6. Regarding Objective #3...There should be more citizen control involved and replacement should consider non-invasive means especially when dealing with sewers in the canyons....Also, purple pipe needs to be included.
7. Revise Objective #4 - "Program the undergrounding telephone and electric power lines" to "Underground all utilities."
8. Delete Objective #5 - "~~Maximize the use of existing facilities for community activities.~~"
9. Revise Objective #6 to read, "Increase Provide improved vehicular and pedestrian street lighting to enhance community character and to promote safety at appropriate locations."
10. Objective #7 – Encourage a full range of health care facilities within the community - no comment.

Other comments:

1. Consider including audio/noise limitations for businesses, especially those with outdoor activity elements.

Continuing Recreational Equivalencies Discussion: Questions asked & Comments made.

1. What do equivalencies mean in terms of financing?
2. Previously heard that there was a percentage limitation on how much park need could be met through equivalencies....Also, that it had to be above what was normally provided.

3. Sounds like there would be less protection for communities?
4. Would we be able to review each and every equivalency idea before applying DIF?
5. Could we put in the community plan that we have the final say?
6. How strong can we state that the Community Planning Group get's the final say on proposed equivalency projects?
7. Behind the North Park Theater – is that an equivalency?
8. Can we be provided with an unfunded needs list?
9. Equivalency definition has evolved from some that it is offsite to something that can be within the community. Could they also be temporary?
10. The fear of using regional parks for community equivalency is that you double-dip when those lands are really unavailable.
11. If a portion of Balboa Park is used for equivalencies who or what board decides?